

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-11 and 17-68 are pending in this application. The Specification and claims 1, 17, 25, 27, 36, 37, 45, 46, 48, 53, 57, 58, and 63 have been amended. Claims 12-16 have been canceled and new claims 65-68 have been added. Support for the amendments can be found, for example, at paragraphs [0100]-[0102] of the specification and in Fig 3. No new matter has been added.

Applicants appreciate the courtesies shown to Applicants' representative by Examiners Chang and Jaroenchonwanit during the January 10, 2008 personal interview. Applicants' separate record of the substance of the interview is incorporated into the following remarks.

The Specification was objected to for failing to provide a descriptive title and for containing embedded hyperlinks. The Specification has been amended responsive to the objection. Accordingly, withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

Claims 37-44 were objected to for failing to comply with formalities. Claim 37 has been amended to correct its dependency. Accordingly, withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

Claims 17, 25, 26, 37-44 and 57 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. These claims have been amended responsive to the rejection. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 46-49 and 53 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,956,487 (hereinafter "Venkatraman"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 46 has been amended to include "displaying a listing of the general information, such that the general information is selectable by a user, only when it is determined that the service information includes the general information, wherein the listing of the general information is not obtained in accordance with the link information." Claim 48

has been amended to include a similar feature. As discussed during the January 10, 2008 personal interview, Venkatraman fails to disclose the features of amended claims 46, 48, and 53.

Referring to Fig. 1a, Venkatraman discloses a device 10 including a web server 14 that generates a web page 18 that defines a set of user interface functions for the device 10 and a network interface 12 that transfers the web page 18 to a requesting HTTP client via communication path 22. Referring to Fig. 2, when a user enters a URL corresponding to the device 10 using the web browser 40, the web browser 40 transfers an HTTP command to device 10 via the communication path 22. An HTML file corresponding to the device web page 18 is then transferred to the web browser 40 and rendered on display 42.

Fig. 3 of Venkatraman depicts the device web page 18 that is displayed on the display 42. In Venkatraman, when a device is selected (by a user inputting the URL corresponding to the device), the HTML file corresponding to the device's web page is always sent in response. Even if the device web page 18 does not contain embedded links 66-68, the device web page 18 would be displayed when the user inputs the corresponding URL. Thus, the device web page 18 does not correspond to the listing of general information of claims 46 and 48 because the listing of general information is only displayed when it is determined that the service information received includes the general information.

Further, the device web page 18 does not correspond to the listing of general information because the web page 18 is obtained in accordance with the associated URL, and thus Venkatraman fails to teach or suggest "wherein the listing of the general information is not obtained in accordance with the link information," (emphasis added) as recited by claim 46, and as similarly recited by claim 48.

With respect to claim 53, Venkatraman fails to teach or suggest "a link information transmitting system that transmits the link information to the information output device when

an operation state of said electronic device satisfies a predetermined condition" (emphasis added). In rejecting claim 53 on pg. 4, the Office Action does not assert that Venkatraman discloses this feature, and thus implicitly acknowledges that it does not. In Venkatraman, the device web page 18 is displayed only when a user enters the corresponding URL.

Venkatraman fails to teach or suggest transferring the HTML file corresponding to the web page 18 when an operation state of said electronic device satisfies a predetermined condition.

Therefore, claims 46, 48, and 53 are patentable over Venkatraman. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-9, 11, 12, 18, 20-32, 36-41, 44, 45, 58-61, and 63 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 6,198,479 (hereinafter "Humbleman") in view of Venkatraman. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As discussed during the January 10, 2008 personal interview, and for the reasons discussed above with respect to independent claims 46 and 48, Venkatraman fails to teach or suggest the features of independent claims 1, 27, 36, 45, 58, and 63. Further, Humbleman fails to cure the deficiencies of Venkatraman.

Humbleman discloses an apparatus providing a user interface on a client device that permits a user to select and control of plurality of devices to perform a service. Each device has an HTML file associated with it that can be received by the client device which employs browser technology to graphically display the information contained in the HTML file. (See col. 7, lines 34-45).

In Humbleman, when a user selects a particular device by way of a client device, the HTML file corresponding to the selected device is transferred to the client device. However, Humbleman fails to teach or suggest "displaying a listing of the general information, such that the general information is selectable by a user, only when it is determined that the service

information includes the general information, wherein the listing of the general information is not obtained in accordance with the link information."

Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 10, 16, and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Humpleman, in view of Venkatraman, and further in view of what was allegedly known in the art at the time of Applicants' invention; claims 13-15, 33, 34, 42, 43, and 54-56 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Humpleman, in view of Venkatraman, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,167,448 (hereinafter "Hemphill"); claims 19, 35, 62, and 64 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Humpleman, in view of Venkatraman, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,654,801 (hereinafter "Mann"); claims 50 and 51 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Venkatraman, in view of Humpleman; claim 52 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Venkatraman, in view of what was allegedly known in the art at the time of Applicants' invention; and claim 57 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Humpleman, in view of Venkatraman, further in view of Hemphill, and still further in view of what was allegedly known in the art at the time of Applicants' invention. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Hemphill and Mann fail to cure the deficiencies of Humpleman and Venkatraman.

Therefore, independent claims 1, 27, 36, 45, 46, 48, 53, 58, and 63 are patentable over the applied references in any combination. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

It is also respectfully submitted that independent claim 65 is patentable. None of the applied references, in any combination, teach or suggest "a link transmitting system that transmits the link information when the change of the operation status is detected by the detecting system," as recited by claim 65.

In addition, Official Notice was taken that use of the UPnP protocol would have been obvious at the time of Applicants' invention. This Official Notice is respectfully traversed.

A finding of Official Notice must be supported by documentary evidence. "Official Notice unsupported by documentary evidence should only be taken ... where the facts asserted to be well-known, or to be common knowledge in the art, are capable of instant and unquestionable determination as being well-known." (See MPEP §2144.03A). "It is never appropriate to rely solely on 'common knowledge' in the art without evidentiary support in the record, as the principal evidence upon which a rejection is based." (See MPEP §2144.03A). No evidentiary support for the assertion that it would have been obvious to combine the UPnP protocol with the present disclosure has been provided. Further, use of the UPnP protocol is not "capable of instant and unquestionable determination as being well-known."

Accordingly, withdrawal of the finding of Official Notice is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff  
Registration No. 27,075

Srikant Viswanadham  
Registration No. 60,111

JAO:SQV/jnm

Attachments:

Petition for Extension of Time  
Amendment Transmittal

Date: January 11, 2008

**OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC**  
**P.O. Box 19928**  
**Alexandria, Virginia 22320**  
**Telephone: (703) 836-6400**

**DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE  
AUTHORIZATION**

Please grant any extension  
necessary for entry;  
Charge any fee due to our  
Deposit Account No. 15-0461